

Ensemble Data Assimilation with the NCEP Global Forecast System

Jeffrey S. Whitaker*, Thomas M. Hamill, and Xue Wei

NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Boulder, CO

Yucheng Song and Zoltan Toth

NCEP Environmental Modelling Center

submitted to *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, revised

December 27, 2006

*325 Broadway R/PSD1, Boulder, CO 80305-3328, Jeffrey.S.Whitaker@noaa.gov

Abstract

Real-data experiments with an ensemble data assimilation system using the NCEP Global Forecast System model were performed and compared with the NCEP Global Data Assimilation System (GDAS). All observations in the operational data stream were assimilated for the period January 1 to February 10, 2004, except satellite radiances. Because of computational resource limitations, the comparison was done at lower resolution (triangular truncation at wavenumber 62 with 28 levels) than the GDAS real-time NCEP operational runs (triangular truncation at wavenumber 254 with 64 levels).

The ensemble data assimilation system outperformed the reduced-resolution version of the NCEP operational 3D-Var system, with the biggest improvement in data sparse regions. Ensemble data assimilation analyses yielded a 24-hour improvement in forecast skill in the Southern Hemisphere extratropics relative to the NCEP 3D-Var system (the 48-hour forecast from the ensemble data assimilation system was as accurate as the 24-hour forecast from the 3D-Var system). Improvements in the data-rich Northern Hemisphere, while still statistically significant, were more modest. It remains to be seen whether the improvements seen in the Southern Hemisphere will be retained when satellite radiances are assimilated. Three different parameterizations of background errors unaccounted for in the data assimilation system (including model error) were tested and found to perform similarly.

1. Introduction

Ensemble-based data assimilation (EDA) methods are emerging as alternatives to four-dimensional variational (4D-Var) methods (e.g. Thépaut and P. Courtier 1991; Courtier et al. 1994; Rabier et al. 2000) for operational atmospheric data assimilation systems. All EDA algorithms are inspired by the Kalman Filter (KF), though in EDA the background-error covariances are estimated from an ensemble of short-term model forecasts instead of propagating the background-error covariance matrix explicitly with a linear model. Since the KF provides the optimal solution to the data assimilation problem when the error dynamics are linear, and the error covariances are Gaussian and perfectly known, EDA methods also are optimal under the same conditions, as long as the ensemble size is large enough. EDA systems have developed along two primary lines, 'stochastic filters' which use random number realizations to simulate observation error (e.g. Burgers et al. 1998; Houtekamer and Mitchell 1998), and 'deterministic filters' (e.g. Tippett et al. 2003; Whitaker and Hamill 2002; Anderson 2001; Bishop et al. 2001; Ott et al. 2004) which do not. Comprehensive overviews of ensemble data assimilation techniques can be found in Evensen (2003) and Hamill (2006). EDA methods are potentially attractive alternatives to 4D-Var mainly for three reasons. First, they are very simple to code and maintain, for there is no variational minimization involved, and no adjoint of the forecast model is necessary¹. Secondly, they automatically provide an ensemble of states to initialize ensemble forecasts, eliminating the need to run additional algorithms to generate perturbed initial conditions. Thirdly, it is relatively straightforward to treat the effects of model error. In simple models, EDA methods have been shown to perform similarly to 4D-

¹The adjoint of the forecast model is not strictly necessary for 4D-Var, but is used to iteratively minimize the cost function in all current operational implementations.

Var, as long as the assimilation window in 4D-Var is long enough, and better than 4D-Var if the assimilation window is too short (Kalnay et al. 2006).

Although most studies to date have tested EDA systems either in idealized models or under perfect model assumptions, there has been progress recently on testing EDA systems with real weather prediction models and observations. Whitaker et al. (2004) and Compo et al. (2006) showed that EDA are well-suited to the problem of historical reanalysis, since the flow-dependent background error estimates they provide are especially important when observations are sparse (e.g. Hamill and Snyder 2000; Bouttier 1994). Houtekamer et al. (2005) have implemented an EDA system at the Meteorological Service of Canada (MSC), and their initial implementation was shown to perform similarly to the then operational system (based on three-dimensional variational assimilation, or 3D-Var). In this study we have compared the performance of our EDA system with that of a reduced-resolution version of the NCEP operational 3D-Var Global Data Assimilation System (GDAS, Parrish and Derber (1992), Derber and Wu (1998), NCEP Environmental Modelling Center (2004)) for the period January 1 to February 10, 2004.

The ensemble data assimilation system and experimental design are described in section 2. The results of the EDA assimilation experiments are presented in section 3 and compared with the benchmark run of the NCEP GDAS. Particular attention is paid to the sensitivity of the results to the method for parameterizing model error. In section 3d, our EDA algorithm is compared with a different implementation developed at the University of Maryland called the Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (Hunt et al. 2006). The results are summarized in the final section and their implications for further development of ensemble data assimilation are discussed.

2. Experimental Design

a. Observations

All of the observations used in the NCEP GDAS² during the period January 1 to February 10, 2004, except the satellite radiances, are input into the ensemble data assimilation system. The decision not to include satellite radiances in our initial tests of the EDA was made partially to lessen the computational expense, and thereby permit a larger number of experiments to be run. Since the effective assimilation of satellite radiances depends crucially on issues related to bias correction, quality control, and radiative transfer, we also felt that withholding radiance observations would simplify a comparison of the methods used to calculate the analysis increment. Since the background-error covariances in the operational NCEP GDAS system were tuned for a observation network that includes satellite radiances, we re-tuned the background error variances used in the GDAS benchmark run to obtain the best possible analysis without satellite radiances (see Appendix for details).

The calculation of the forward (\mathbf{H}) operator was performed by running the NCEP GDAS system once for each ensemble member, saving the values of $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^b$ (where \mathbf{x}^b is the background, or first-guess model forecast) to a file, and exiting the code before the computation of the analysis increment. The observation-error covariances (\mathbf{R}) were set to the same values used in the NCEP GDAS.

²See http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/mmb/data_processing/prepbufr.doc/table_2.htm for a detailed description of these observations. There are approximately 250,000 to 350,000 non-radiance observations at each analysis time, including satellite cloud drift winds.

b. The forecast model and benchmark.

The forecast model used is the forecast model component NCEP global forecast system (GFS). We have used a version that was operational in March 2004. The GDAS that was operational at the time (Global Climate and Weather Modelling Branch, Environmental Modelling Center 2003) uses a first-guess forecast run at a triangular truncation at wavenumber 254, with 64 sigma levels (T254L64). Computational constraints required us to use a lower resolution for ensemble data assimilation system (T62L28), with the uppermost level at approximately 3 hPa. A digital filter (Lynch and Huang 1992) with a span of six hours centered on the 3-hour forecast is performed during the 6-hour first-guess forecast, as in the operational GDAS. The digital filter diminishes gravity wave oscillations by temporally filtering the model variables. The performance of the ensemble data assimilation system is evaluated relative to a special run of the NCEP GDAS operational in March 2004 using the same reduced resolution forecast model and the same reduced set of non-radiance observations, but with the background error variances re-tuned to account for the exclusion of satellite radiances as described in the Appendix. We call the analyses generated from this special reduced resolution run of the GDAS the 'NCEP-Benchmark', while the operational GDAS analyses are referred to as "NCEP-Operational". The NCEP-Operational analyses were run at much higher resolution (T254L64) and included satellite radiances in the assimilation. The quality of the analyses produced by the EDA system are assessed by performing single deterministic forecasts initialized from the ensemble-mean EDA analyses and the NCEP-Benchmark analyses, with the same T62L28 version of the NCEP GFS. These forecasts are verified against observations, and the NCEP-Operational analyses.

c. Computing the analysis increment

Ensemble data assimilation systems are designed to update a forecast ensemble to produce analysis ensemble with an improved mean and perturbations that sample the analysis-error covariance. Following the notation of Ide et al. (1997), let \mathbf{x}^b be an m -dimensional background model forecast; let \mathbf{y}^o be a p -dimensional set of observations; let \mathbf{H} be the operator that converts the model state to the observation space; let \mathbf{P}^b be the $m \times m$ -dimensional background-error covariance matrix; and let \mathbf{R} be the $p \times p$ -dimensional observation-error covariance matrix. The minimum error-variance estimate of the analyzed state \mathbf{x}^a is then given by the traditional Kalman filter update equation (Lorenc 1986),

$$\mathbf{x}^a = \mathbf{x}^b + \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{y}^o - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^b), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{P}^b \mathbf{H}^T (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}^b \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R})^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

In ensemble data assimilation, $\mathbf{P}^b \mathbf{H}^T$ is approximated using the sample covariance estimated from an ensemble of model forecasts. For the rest of the paper, the symbol \mathbf{P}^b is used to denote the sample covariance from an ensemble, and \mathbf{K} is understood to be computed using sample covariances. Expressing the model state vector as an ensemble mean (denoted by an over-bar) and a deviation from the mean (denoted by a prime), the update equations for the Ensemble Square-Root Filter (EnSRF, Whitaker and Hamill 2002) may be written as

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}^a = \bar{\mathbf{x}}^b + \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{y}^o - \mathbf{H}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^b), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{x}'^a = \mathbf{x}'^b - \tilde{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'^b, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{P}^b\mathbf{H}^T = \overline{\mathbf{x}'^b(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'^b)^T} \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}'_i{}^b(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'_i{}^b)^T$, $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^b\mathbf{H}^T = \overline{\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'^b(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'^b)^T} \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'_i{}^b(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}'_i{}^b)^T$ n is the ensemble size ($= 100$ unless otherwise noted), \mathbf{K} is the Kalman gain given by (2) and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ is the gain used to update deviations from the ensemble mean. Note that an over-bar used in a covariance estimate implies a factor of $n - 1$ instead of n in the denominator, so that the estimate is unbiased. If \mathbf{R} is diagonal, observations may be assimilated serially, one at a time, so that the analysis after assimilation of the N th observation becomes the background estimate for assimilating the $(N + 1)$ th observation (Gelb et al. 1974). With this simplification, $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ may be written as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{R}{\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^b\mathbf{H}^T + R}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{K}, \quad (5)$$

for an individual observation, where R and $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^b\mathbf{H}^T$ are scalars, while \mathbf{K} and $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ are vectors of the same dimension as the model state vector (Whitaker and Hamill 2002).

Distance-dependent covariance localization (Houtekamer and Mitchell 2001; Hamill et al. 2001) is employed to account for sampling error in the estimation of the background-error covariances. Background-error covariances are forced to taper smoothly to zero 2800 km away from the observation in the horizontal, and two scale heights ($-\ln(\sigma)$, where $\sigma = \frac{p}{p_s}$) in the vertical.

These values are the same as used in the MSC Ensemble Kalman Filter (Houtekamer and Mitchell 2005) operational in 2005. The Blackman window function (Oppenheim and Schaffer 1989)

$$\begin{aligned} A(r) &= 0.42 + 0.5 \cos \frac{\pi r}{L} + 0.08 \cos \frac{2\pi r}{L} & r \leq L \\ A(r) &= 0 & r > L \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

(where r is the horizontal or vertical distance from the observation, and L is the distance at which the covariances are forced to be zero), commonly used in power spectrum estimation, is used to taper the covariances in both the horizontal and vertical. We chose this function instead of the more popular Gaspari-Cohn 5th order polynomial (Gaspari and Cohn 1999) since it was faster to evaluate on our computing platform.

The serial processing algorithm employed here is somewhat different than that described in Whitaker et al. (2004). Here we follow an approach similar to that used in the Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (LETKF, Hunt et al. (2006)). In the LETKF, each element of the state vector is updated independently, using all of the observations in a local region surrounding that element. All of the observations in the local region are used simultaneously to update the state vector element using the Kalman Filter update equations expressed in the subspace of the ensemble. Here we loop over all of the observations that affect each state vector element, and update that state vector element for each observation using (3) and (4). As suggested by Houtekamer et al. (2005), the forward interpolation operation (the computation of the observation priors, or $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^b$) is precomputed, using the background forecast at several times levels in order to include time interpolation. During the state update (which consists of a loop over all the elements of the state vector), both the

current state vector element and all the observation priors which affect that state vector element are updated. The process can be summarized as follows:

1. Integrate the forecast model forward $t_a + 0.5t_a$ from the previous analysis time for each ensemble member (where $t_a = 6$ hours is the interval at which observations are assimilated), Save hourly output for each ensemble member from time $t = t_a - 0.5t_a$ to $t_a + 0.5t_a$.
2. Compute the observation priors for all observations and ensemble members (i.e. compute $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}^b$). Since the observations occur over the time window $t_a - 0.5t_a$ to $t_a + 0.5t_a$, this involves linear interpolation in time using the hourly model output.
3. Update each element of the model state vector at time $t = t_a$. For each element of the state vector (which here includes winds, virtual temperature, surface pressure and specific humidity), find all the observations and their associated priors that are 'close' to that element (where the definition of 'close' is determined by the covariance localization length scales in the horizontal and vertical). Estimate how much each observation would reduce the ensemble variance for that state element if it were assimilated in isolation, using (4). Sort the observations according to this estimate, so the observations with the largest expected variance reduction are treated first. Loop over the observation in this order and compute the ratio of the posterior to prior ensemble variance (F) for the current state vector element. If $F \geq 0.99$, skip to the next observation. If $F < 0.99$, update the current state vector element for this observation using (3) and (4). Also update all the 'close' observation priors for this observation (except those for observations which have already been used to update this state element, or those for observations which have been skipped because F exceeded 0.99, since

those observation priors are no longer needed to update the current state vector element).

Proceed to the next element of the state vector and repeat. This step can be performed for each state vector element independently in a multi-processor computing environment, as long as each processor has access to all the observation priors that can affect the state vector element being updated on that processor. Since the update of the observation priors is done independently on each processor, no communication between processors is necessary.

4. After all elements of the state vector have been updated, adjust the ensemble perturbations to account to unrepresented sources of error (see section 2d). Go to step (1) and repeat for the next analysis time.

Step (3) includes an adaptive observation thinning algorithm designed to skip observations whose information content is deemed to be negligible. Unlike other recently proposed adaptive thinning algorithms (see Ochotta et al. (2005) and references therein), it uses a flow-dependent estimate of analysis uncertainty to determine if measurements are redundant. If the ratio F (describing the variance of the updated ensemble to the prior ensemble) is close to 1.0, the observation will have little impact on the ensemble variance for that state vector element. This is likely to be true if a previously assimilated observation has already significantly reduced the ensemble variance for that state element. This approach not only dramatically reduces the computational cost of the state update when observations are very dense, but it also partially mitigates the effect of unaccounted-for correlated observation errors. When observations are much denser than the grid spacing of the forecast model, they are likely resolving scales not represented by the forecast model. Typically, these 'errors of representativeness' are accounted for by increasing the value of

R. However, 'representativeness errors' also have horizontal correlations, which are usually not accounted for. Liu and Rabier (2002) showed that assimilating dense observations with correlated errors with a suboptimal scheme that ignores those error correlations can actually degrade the analysis (compared to an analysis in which the observations are thinned so that the separation between observations is greater than the distance at which their errors are correlated). The adaptive thinning strategy employed here has the effect of sub-sampling the observations so that the mean areal separation between observations used to update a given state vector element is increased. The critical value of F used in the thinning (set to 0.99 in this study) can be used to control this separation, with smaller values of F result in larger separation distances. Adaptive thinning may actually improve the analysis in situations where there are significant unaccounted-for error correlations between nearby observations. If correlations between nearby observations are properly accounted for in \mathbf{R} , there should be no benefit to this type of adaptive thinning, other than to reduce the computational cost of computing the analysis increment. There are some potential problems with this adaptive thinning algorithm. For one, since the observation selection proceeds serially, starting with observations which will have the largest predicted impact on ensemble variance, it is possible that a less accurate observation (for example, a satellite-derived wind) will be selected over a more accurate one (say, a radiosonde wind), if the less accurate one is predicted to have a larger impact on ensemble variance. Although in principle the less accurate observation should be of greater utility in this situation, under some circumstances one may prefer to assimilate the 'best', or most accurate observation. Secondly, since each state vector element is updated independently, it is possible that quite different sets of observations will be selected to update adjacent grid points,

potentially resulting in discontinuities in the analyzed fields.

The main advantage of this approach over the serial processing algorithm used in Whitaker et al. (2004) is that it is more easily parallelized on massively parallel computers. Step (3), the update for each element of the state vector, can be performed independently for each element of the state vector. Therefore, the state vector can be partitioned arbitrarily, and each partition can be updated on a separate processor. No communication between processors is necessary during the state update. However, there is a significant amount of redundant computation associated with the update of the observation priors in step (3). This is because nearby state vector elements are influenced by overlapping sets of observations, so that different processors must update nearly identical sets of observation priors.

Since the observation network is very inhomogeneous, some elements of the state vector can be influenced by much larger number of observations than other elements. For example, state vector elements in the mesosphere or near the South Pole will be influenced by very few observations, while those in the lower troposphere over Europe or North America will be influenced by a much larger number of observations. To alleviate load imbalances which may occur if some processors are updating state vector elements which are 'observation rich', while others are updating state vector elements that are 'observation poor', the latitude and longitude indices of the model state vector are randomly shuffled before being assigned to individual processors. This means that all of the observations and observation priors must be distributed to all processors.

The algorithm used here has a couple of potential advantages over the LETKF. The serial processing algorithm allows for adaptive thinning of observations, in a way that is not easily achiev-

able in the LETKF framework where all the observations are assimilated simultaneously. This may prove to be a benefit when observation errors are significantly correlated, but assumed to be uncorrelated. However, if observation error correlations are accounted for in \mathbf{R} , the LETKF may be preferable, since serial processing becomes significantly more complicated when \mathbf{R} is not diagonal (the ensemble must be transformed into a space in which \mathbf{R} is diagonal (Kaminski et al. 1971)). Since the LETKF is performed in the subspace of the ensemble, covariance localization as it is traditionally applied, is problematic. Hunt et al. (2006) have suggested that effect of covariance localization may be mimicked in the LETKF by increasing the value of \mathbf{R} as a function of the distance from the state vector element being updated. This “observation-error localization”, tested in the LETKF by Miyoshi and Yamane (2006), allows the influence of observations to decay smoothly to zero at a specified distance from an analysis grid point without increasing the effective number of degrees of freedom in the ensemble (as is the case when covariance localization is applied to \mathbf{P}^b). Our code allows the LETKF algorithm or the serial processing algorithm to be activated by a run-time switch. In section 3d, we will compare assimilation results using the LETKF with observation-error localization (using all available observations), to those obtained using the serial algorithm with “traditional” covariance localization (and adaptive observation thinning).

d. Accounting for system errors

As discussed in Houtekamer and Mitchell (2005), ensemble data assimilation systems are sub-optimal because of (i) sampling error in the estimation of background-error covariances, (ii) errors in the specification of the observation error statistics, (iii) errors in the forward interpolation oper-

ator, (iv) possible non-Gaussianity of forecast and observation errors, and (v) errors in the forecast model that have not been accounted for. The effects of all of these are mixed together as the assimilation system is cycled, so a quantitative assessment of their relative impacts is difficult. Their net effect on an ensemble data assimilation system is to introduce a bias in the error covariances, such that they are too small and span a different eigenspace than the forecast errors. As a result, various ad-hoc measures must be taken to avoid filter divergence. For example;

- Distance-dependent covariance localization (Houtekamer and Mitchell 2001; Hamill et al. 2001) is usually employed to combat (i), and is used here.
- Adaptive thinning of observations as previously described, or the construction of 'super-observations' (Daley 1991) are examples of methods used to combat (ii).
- The effects of (iii) are often accounted for indirectly by increasing the value of the observation error to account for the "error of representativeness", while keeping \mathbf{R} diagonal. However, this approach does not fully account for the spatially correlated part of the error in the forward operator.
- The Kalman filter is a special case of Bayesian state estimation which assumes normal error distributions, so the effects of (iv) can only be dealt with relaxing that assumption, which implies a re-definition of the update equations (1)- (5).

Item (v), model error, is the most difficult to deal with. In fact, as pointed out by Houtekamer and Mitchell (2005), this category is often used as a catch-all for the effects of all mis-represented error sources which are accumulated as the data assimilation system is cycled, and may more prop-

erly be termed “system error”. We have tested three relatively simple methods for accounting for system error in our data assimilation system. These are (i) covariance, or multiplicative inflation (Anderson and Anderson 1999), (ii) additive inflation (Houtekamer and Mitchell 2005), and (iii) relaxation-to-prior (Zhang et al. 2004). These methods are meant to account for biases in the second moment of the ensemble, and not the mean. Systematic model errors can cause the ensemble mean to be biased. Schemes to correct for systematic model errors in EDA have been proposed (Baek et al. 2006; Keppenne et al. 2005), but in the experiments shown here we have not accounted for biases in the ensemble mean first guess. Each of the three methods used here are applied to the posterior ensemble, after the computation of the analysis increment and before running the forecasts to be used as the first-guess for the next state update. This is done to more easily accommodate time interpolation in the forward operator. Since time interpolation requires use of the first-guess ensemble at several forecast times, if the system error parameterization were applied to the prior ensemble instead of the posterior ensemble, the parameterization would have to be applied at each forecast time used in the time interpolation. Applying these parameterizations to the posterior ensemble is justified by our re-interpretation of the model error as a system error reflecting an accumulation of errors arising from several components of the data assimilation system, not just the forecast model (Houtekamer and Mitchell 2005). Another method for dealing with model error, which we have not investigated here, involves explicitly accounting for the uncertainty in the forecast model by using a multi-model ensemble (Meng and Zhang 2006; Houtekamer et al. 1996).

The first method for treating system error, known as covariance, or multiplicative inflation (Anderson and Anderson 1999) simply inflates the deviations from the ensemble mean by a factor $r > 1.0$ for each member of the ensemble. We have found that different inflation factors were required in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres and in the troposphere and stratosphere, due to the large differences in the density of the observing networks. In the limit that there are no observations influencing the analysis in a given region, it is easy to envision how inflating the ensemble every analysis time can lead to unrealistically large ensemble variances, perhaps even exceeding the climatological variance (Hamill and Whitaker 2005). Here we use an inflation factor of $r = 1.30$ in the Northern Hemisphere (poleward of $25^{\circ}N$) at $\sigma = 1$, $r = 1.18$ in the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $25^{\circ}S$) at $\sigma = 1$ and value of $r = 1.24$ in the tropics (between of $15^{\circ}S$ and $15^{\circ}N$) at $\sigma = 1$. The values vary linearly in latitude in the transition zone between the tropics and extra-tropics. In the vertical, the values of r taper smoothly from their maximum values at the surface to 1.0 at six scale heights ($-\ln(\sigma) = 6$). The Blackman function, (6), is used to taper the inflation factor in the vertical.

The second method for treating system error is additive inflation. In the standard Kalman filter formulation, model error is parameterized by adding random noise with a specified covariance structure in space, and zero correlation in time, to the background-error covariances after those covariances are propagated from the previous analysis time using a linear model. Applying this approach to an ensemble filter involves adding random perturbations, sampled from a distribution with known covariance statistics, to each ensemble member. This technique, which is currently used by the MSC in their operational ensemble data assimilation system, we call additive inflation.

MSC uses random samples from a simplified version of their operational static covariance model. Here we have chosen to use scaled random differences between adjacent 6-hourly analyses from the NCEP-NCAR Reanalysis (Kistler et al. 2001). The reason for this choice is that 6-h tendencies will emphasize baroclinically growing, synoptic-scale structures in middle latitudes, while 3D-Var covariance structures tend to be larger scale and barotropic. Analysis systems which only use information about observations prior to the analysis time tend to concentrate error in the subspace of growing disturbances (e.g. Pires et al. 1996), so our use of 6-h tendencies is based on the assumption that the accumulated effect of unrepresented errors in the data assimilation system will be concentrated in dynamically active, growing structures. This choice of additive inflation was shown to work well in a study of the effect of model error on an ensemble data assimilation in an idealized general circulation model (Hamill and Whitaker 2005). The random samples are selected from the subset of 6-hourly reanalyses for the period 1971-2000 that are within 15 days of the calendar date of the analysis time. The differences between these randomly selected, adjacent analysis times are scaled by 0.33 before being added to each member of the posterior, or analysis ensemble.

The third method for treating system error, relaxation-to-prior, was proposed by Zhang et al. (2004) as an alternative to covariance inflation. The name refers to that fact that it relaxes the analysis perturbations back toward the prior perturbations independently at each analysis point via

$$\mathbf{x}'^a \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{x}'^a + \alpha\mathbf{x}'^b. \quad (7)$$

The adjustment is performed after the state update, and the modified analysis perturbations are then integrated forward to form the background ensemble for the next analysis time. The advantage of this approach relative to covariance inflation is that the ensemble perturbations are only modified where observations have an effect on the analysis, thereby avoiding the tendency for ensemble variance to increase without bound where observations have no influence. Zhang et al. (2004) used a value of 0.5 for their convective-scale ensemble data assimilation experiment. Here we found that a much larger value, 0.88, was necessary to prevent ensemble variance becoming too small during the two-month assimilation window. A value of 0.88 means that the weight given to the prior ensemble perturbations is 88%, and only 12% weight is given to the analysis perturbations computed from the state update (4).

3. Results

Three experiments were performed with the EDA. All of the experiments used the parameter settings given in the previous section for covariance localization and adaptive observation thinning. Only the parameterization of system error was changed. The “EDA-multinf” experiment used multiplicative covariance inflation, the “EDA-addinf” used additive inflation (derived from random samples of six-hour differences from the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis), and the “EDA-relaxprior” experiment used the relaxation-to-prior method to increase the variance in the posterior ensemble. The parameter settings used for these three experiments are as given in the previous section. Assimilations were performed for the period 00 UTC 1 January 2004 (2004010100) to 00 UTC 10 February, 2004 (2004021000). Forecasts initialized from the ensemble mean analyses

for each of these experiments are compared with forecasts initialized from the NCEP-Benchmark analyses. The forecasts were run at T62L28 resolution (the same resolution used in the data assimilation cycle), and are verified against observations and the NCEP-Operational analyses. The initial ensemble for the EDA assimilation runs consisted of a random sample of 100 operational GDAS analyses from February 2004. The NCEP-Benchmark assimilation run was started from the operational GDAS analysis on 2004010100. After an initial spinup period of one week, verification statistics were computed for 125 forecasts initialized every 6 hours from 2004010800 to 2004020800.

a. Verification using observations.

Three different subsets of observations were used for forecast verifications: marine surface pressure observations, upper-tropospheric (300-150 hPa) aircraft report (AIREP) and pilot report (PIREP) wind observations, and radiosonde profiles of wind and temperature. Note that this subset is only a small fraction of the total number of observations assimilated. Figure 1 shows the spatial distribution of these observation types for a typical day. Radiosonde observations mainly sample the continental regions of the Northern Hemisphere. Marine surface pressure observations sample the ocean regions of both hemispheres, but are densest in the North Atlantic. Aircraft observations are mainly confined to the western half of the Northern Hemisphere, but sample both the continents of North America and Europe and the Pacific and Atlantic ocean basins.

Table 1 shows the root-mean-square (RMS) fit of 48-h forecasts to marine surface pressure and upper-tropospheric aircraft meridional wind observations. With the possible exception of the EDA-

relaxprior forecasts of meridional wind, the EDA-based forecasts fit the observations significantly better than the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts. The significance level from a paired sample t-test (Wilks 2006, p. 455) for the difference between the mean EDA forecast fits and the mean NCEP-Benchmark forecast fits is also given in Table 1 for each of the EDA experiments. This significance test takes into account serial correlations in the data by modeling the the sample differences as a first-order autoregressive process. The significance level is then computed using an 'effective sample size' $n' = n(1 - r)/(1 + r)$ (Wilks 2006, p. 144), where $n = 125$ is the total sample size, and r is the lag-1 autocorrelation of the forecast error differences. The EDA-addinf forecasts of surface pressure appear to fit the observations better than the EDA-multinf and EDA-relaxprior forecasts, although the differences between the EDA experiments are not significant at the 99% confidence level.

Figure 2 shows the global RMS fit of 6 and 48-h forecasts to radiosonde profiles of meridional wind and temperature for each of the experiments. With the exception of the EDA-relaxprior forecasts, the EDA-based forecasts fit the radiosonde observations at most levels better than the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts. Aggregating all of the observations between $\sigma = 0.9$ and $\sigma = 0.07$, the difference between EDA-addinf and EDA-multinf and the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts is significant at the 99% level. The EDA-relaxprior forecasts are not significantly closer to the radiosonde observations than the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts. The 48-h EDA-addinf forecasts generally have the lowest error, although the differences between the EDA-addinf and EDA-multinf forecasts is not statistically significant at the 99% level.

Table 2 shows the RMS fit of 48-h forecasts to marine surface pressure observations for the

Northern Hemisphere and the Southern Hemisphere separately. We have only stratified the results by hemisphere for marine surface pressure because the other observation types are primarily concentrated in the Northern Hemisphere (Fig. 1). The difference between the fit of EDA forecasts and NCEP-Benchmark forecasts to marine surface pressure observations is larger in the Southern Hemisphere extratropics than in the Northern Hemisphere extratropics (Table 2). This result agrees with previous studies using EDA systems in a perfect-model context (Hamill and Snyder 2000) and using real observations characteristic of observing networks of the early 20th century (Whitaker et al. 2004) which have shown that the flow-dependent background-error covariances these systems provide have the largest impact when the observing network is sparse.

b. Verifications using analyses

When comparing forecasts and analyses from different centers, the standard practice in the operational weather prediction community has been to verify each forecast against its own analysis, that is, the analysis generated by the same center. The problem with this approach is that an analysis can perform well in this metric if the assimilation completely ignores the observations. Here we have the luxury of having an independent, higher quality analysis to verify against, the NCEP-Operational analysis. Since this analysis was run at four times higher resolution and used a large set of observations (including the satellite radiances), we expect it to be significantly better. We have verified that this is indeed the case³, especially in the Southern Hemisphere where satellite radiances have been found to have the largest impact on analysis quality (e.g. Derber and Wu 1998;

³by running forecasts run from the operational analysis with the same T62L28 version of the forecast model and comparing those forecasts with radiosonde and marine surface pressure observations.

Simmons and Hollingsworth 2002).

Figure 3 shows vertical profiles of 48-hour geopotential height and meridional wind forecast errors for both the Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere for forecasts initialized from analyses produced by each of the EDA experiments and the NCEP-Benchmark experiment. Results for zonal wind are very similar to meridional wind (not shown). For the most part, forecasts from each of the EDA experiments track the NCEP-Operational analysis at 48 hours better than the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts. The lone exception is the EDA-relaxprior forecasts of meridional wind in the Northern Hemisphere. All the other EDA forecasts are more skillful than the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts, and these differences are significant at the 99% level at 500 hPa, using a the the paired-sample t-test for serially correlated data described previously. The EDA-addinf performs better overall than the EDA-multinf and EDA-relaxprior experiments, although the differences are only statistically significant at the 99% level in the Northern Hemisphere.

The improvement seen in the EDA experiments relative to the NCEP-Benchmark is especially dramatic in the Southern Hemisphere, where Fig. 4 shows that it is equivalent to 24-hours of lead time (in other words, 48-hour forecasts initialized from the EDA-addinf analyses are about as accurate as 24-hour forecasts initialized from the NCEP-Benchmark 3D-Var analysis). In the Northern Hemisphere, the advantage that the EDA-addinf based forecasts have over the NCEP-Benchmark forecasts is closer to 6-h in lead time. This is further evidence that flow-dependent covariances are most important in data sparse regions. This is illustrated for a specific case in Fig. 5, which shows the 500 hPa analyses produced by the NCEP-Benchmark, NCEP-Operational and EDA-addinf analysis systems for 00 UTC February 3, 2004. The difference between the NCEP-Benchmark

and EDA-addinf analyses is especially large (greater than 100 m) in the trough off the coast of Antarctica near $120^{\circ}W$, where the EDA-addinf is much closer to the NCEP-Operational analysis. This region corresponds to the most data-sparse region of the Southern Hemisphere, as can be seen from the distribution of marine surface pressure observations in Fig. 1. The EDA system is clearly able to extract more information from the sparse Southern Hemisphere observational network than the NCEP Benchmark system, and compares favorably with higher-resolution operational analysis which utilized more than an order of magnitude more observations in this region (by assimilating satellite radiance measurements).

Since in-situ humidity measurements are quite sparse (in the NCEP GDAS system they are only available from radiosondes), one might expect the ensemble-based data assimilation to show a clear advantage over 3D-Var for the moisture field. Fig. 6 shows the RMS error of total precipitable water forecasts for EDA-addinf and NCEP-Benchmark based forecasts. These forecasts are verified against the higher-resolution NCEP operational analysis, which includes remotely sensed humidity measurements. The EDA based forecasts have approximately 12-h advantage in lead time relative to the 3D-Var based forecasts, in both the Northern and Southern Hemisphere extra-tropics. The EDA systems can utilize non-moisture observations to make increments to the first-guess moisture field through cross-covariances between the moisture field and the other state variables provided by the ensemble. In the NCEP 3D-Var system, only observations of humidity can increment the first-guess moisture field, since the static covariance model does not include cross-covariances between humidity and other state variables. Fig. 7 shows the increment of total precipitable water implied by a single observation of surface pressure (shown by the yellow dot) in the EDA-addinf

system for 00 UTC January 30, 2004. The EDA system is able to take into account the dynamical relationship between the strength of the low center and the amplitude of the moisture plume ahead of the cold front. An accurate, flow-dependent treatment of these dynamical relationships, as represented by the cross-variable covariances in the ensemble, are particularly important in the analysis of unobserved variables. Another example of this was given in the context of assimilation of radar reflectivity into a cloud-resolving model by Snyder and Zhang (2003). In that study, the cross-covariances between the predicted radar reflectivity and the other model state variables (winds, temperature, moisture and condensate) provided by the ensemble were crucial in obtaining an accurate analysis when only radar reflectivity was observed.

c. Ensemble Consistency

If the EDA system is performing optimally, the innovation covariances should satisfy

$$\langle (\mathbf{y}^o - \mathbf{H}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^b)(\mathbf{y}^o - \mathbf{H}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^b)^T \rangle = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{P}^b\mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R}. \quad (8)$$

(Houtekamer et al. 2005), where the angle brackets denote the expectation value. Here we compare the diagonal elements of the matrices on the left and right hand sides of (8), computed for radiosonde observations in the EDA experiments. If the magnitudes of those diagonal elements are similar, the ensemble is said to be consistent, i.e., the innovation variances are consistent with the background and observation error variances at the observation locations. This primarily reflects the degree to which parameterization of system error has been tuned, although with the small

number of parameters used here to represent system error it will be difficult if not impossible to achieve a perfect match, unless the parameterization of system error itself is very accurate.

Figure 8 shows the square-root of the ensemble spread plus observation error variance (the diagonal of the right-hand side of (8)) at radiosonde locations for the three EDA experiments. This quantity can be regarded as the “predicted” innovation standard deviation, since if (8) is satisfied, the two quantities will be the same. For the purposes of this discussion we will assume that any disagreement between the left and right hand sides of (8) is due to deficiencies in the background-error covariance, and not the observation-error covariance. The actual innovation standard-deviation (or the root-mean-square fit) is shown in Fig. 8 only for the EDA-addinf experiment, since the radiosonde fits for the other EDA experiments are quite similar. For both temperature and meridional wind, the ensemble spread in the lower-troposphere is deficient for all three EDA experiments. This means that all of the EDA systems are not making optimal use of the radiosondes in the lower troposphere. In particular they are weighting the first guess too much.

Houtekamer et al. (2005) showed diagnostics similar to these for the MSC implementation of the Ensemble Kalman Filter (their Fig. 5). The actual innovation standard deviations for their implementation are quite similar to ours, but the predicted innovation standard deviations appear to match the actual values more closely, particularly in the lower troposphere. In the MSC implementation, system error is additive and is derived from random samples drawn from a simplified version of their operational background-error covariance model. The MSC operational covariance itself has been tuned so that innovation statistics for the radiosonde network are consistent with the observation and background error variance. Therefore, it is perhaps not surprising that the

vertical structure of the predicted innovation standard deviation more closely matches the actual radiosonde innovations. In all three of our system error parameterizations, there is only one parameter that can be tuned (in the case of multiplicative inflation, this parameter can be tuned separately in the Northern Hemisphere, Tropics and Southern Hemisphere). Therefore, the best that can be done is to tune the parameterization so the global (or hemispheric) average predicted innovation standard-deviation matches the actual. The fact that the vertical structure does not match means that all of these system error parameterizations themselves are deficient, and do not correctly represent the vertical structure of the actual system error. In particular, the fact that the multiplicative inflation system error parameterization cannot match the actual vertical structure of the innovation variance suggests that the structure of the underlying system error covariance is quite different than the background-error covariance represented by the dynamical ensemble, since the multiplicative inflation parameterization can only represent the system error in the subspace of the existing ensemble. One can either add more tunable parameters to the parameterizations to force the structures to match, or try to develop new parameterizations that more accurately reflect the structure of the underlying system error covariance.

Equation (8) is derived by assuming that the background forecast and observation errors are uncorrelated, and the observations and background forecast are unbiased (i.e. the expected value of the mean of the innovation $\mathbf{y}^o - \mathbf{H}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^b$ is zero). Figure 9 shows the innovation bias with respect to radiosondes for the EDA-addinf and NCEP-Benchmark experiments (the other EDA experiments (not shown) have similar innovation biases). There are significant temperature biases in the lower troposphere, most likely due to systematic errors in the forecast model's boundary-layer param-

terization. The temperature bias in the lower troposphere is a significant fraction of the root-mean-square fit of the background forecast to the radiosonde observations (Fig. 2). Meridional wind biases are also evident in the lower troposphere and near the tropopause, but are much smaller relative to the root-mean-square fit. For the temperature field at least, the fact that the ensemble spread appears deficient in the lower troposphere can be partially explained by the bias component of the innovations, which is not accounted for in (8). However, the mismatch between the predicted and actual meridional wind innovation standard deviation appears to primarily a result of deficiencies in the parameterization of the system error covariance.

d. Comparison with the LETKF

The Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter proposed by Hunt et al. (2006) is algorithmically very similar to the implementation used here, except that each state vector element is updated using all the observations in the local region simultaneously using the Kalman Filter update equations expressed in the subspace of the ensemble. We have performed an experiment with LETKF with observation error localization, using additive inflation as a parameterization of system error (LETKF-addinf). The parameters settings for the experiment are identical to those used in the EDA-addinf experiment discussed previously. Figure 10 compares the 48-h geopotential height and meridional wind forecast errors for forecasts initialized from the EDA-addinf, LETKF-addinf and NCEP-Benchmark analyses. The skill of LETKF-addinf forecasts and EDA-addinf forecasts are very similar. The small differences between the LETKF-addinf and EDA-addinf experiments could be due to several factors. Firstly, the method used for localizing the impact of observations

is slightly different, the LETKF localizes the impact of observations by increasing the observation error with distance away from the analysis point, while our serial-processing implementation localizes the background-error covariances directly. Further experimentation is needed to see if these approaches are indeed equivalent in practice. Secondly, no adaptive observation thinning was done in the LETKF experiment. The fact that the quality of the EDA-addinf and LETKF-addinf forecasts are so similar in fact suggests that the adaptive observation thinning did not have much of an impact, other than reducing the computational cost of the serial processing algorithm. Regarding computational cost, we note that with the adaptive thinning algorithm, the cost of the two algorithms are similar. If the adaptive thinning is turned off, the serial processing algorithm is nearly an order of magnitude more expensive than the LETKF. Finally, we may not have tuned the parameters to get the best performance from either the LETKF or the serial filter, and it is likely that the optimal parameters are not the same. The differences between the the LETKF-addinf and EDA-addinf experiments are so small that we believe differences in tuning, rather than fundamental differences in the algorithms, are more likely the primary factor.

4. Summary and Discussion

We have shown that ensemble data assimilation outperforms the NCEP operational 3D-Var system, when satellite radiances are withheld and the forecast model is run at reduced resolution (compared to NCEP operations). As expected from previous studies, the biggest improvement is in data sparse regions. Since no satellite radiances were assimilated, the Southern Hemisphere is indeed quite data sparse. The EDA analyses yielded a 24-hour improvement in geopotential height

forecast skill in the Southern Hemisphere extratropics relative to the NCEP 3D-Var system, so that 48-hour EDA-based forecasts are as accurate as 24-hour 3D-Var based forecasts. Improvements in the data-rich Northern Hemisphere, while still statistically significant, were more modest (equivalent to a 6-hour improvement in geopotential height forecast skill). For column integrated water vapor, the EDA-based forecasts yielded a 12-h improvement in forecast skill in both the Northern and Southern Hemisphere extra-tropics. The fact that the improvement seen in the Northern Hemisphere is larger for the moisture field than the temperature field is consistent with the fact that in-situ measurements of humidity are sparse in both hemispheres. It remains to be seen whether the magnitude of the improvements seen will be retained when satellite radiances are assimilated.

Three different parameterizations of system error (which is most likely dominated by model error) were tested. All three performed similarly, but a parameterization based on additive inflation using random samples of reanalysis 6-hour differences performed slightly better in our tests. All the parameterizations tested failed to accurately predict the structure of the forecast innovation variance, suggesting that further improvements in ensemble data assimilation may be achieved when methods for better accounting for the covariance structure of system error are developed. Significant innovation biases were found, primarily for lower tropospheric temperature, suggesting that bias removal algorithms for EDA (such as those proposed by Baek et al. (2006) and Keppenne et al. (2005)) could also significantly improve the performance of EDA systems.

We believe that these results warrant accelerated development of ensemble data assimilation systems for operational weather prediction. The limiting factor in the performance of these systems is almost certainly the parameterization of system error. Even without further improvements in

the parameterization of model error, ensemble data assimilation systems should become more and more accurate relative to 3D-Var systems as forecast models improve and the amplitude of the model-error part of the background-error covariance decreases. Current generation ensemble data assimilation systems are computationally competitive with their primary alternative, 4D-Var. However, they are considerably simpler to code and maintain, since an adjoint of the forecast model is not needed.

Acknowledgments

Fruitful discussions with C. Bishop, E. Kalnay, J. Anderson, I. Szyunogh, P. Houtekamer, F. Zhang, G. Compo, H. Mitchell and B. Hunt are gratefully acknowledged, as are the comments of three anonymous reviewers. This project would not have been possible without the support of the NOAA THORPEX program, which partially funded this research through a grant, and NOAA's Forecast Systems Laboratory, which provided access to their High Performance Computing System. One of us (Hamill) was partially supported through the National Science Foundation grants ATM-0130154 and ATM-020561.

Appendix: Re-tuning the NCEP GDAS background error.

The background error covariances in the NCEP GDAS were originally obtained using the so-called 'NMC method' (Parrish and Derber 1992). This method assumes that the statistical structure of forecast errors varies little over 48 hours, so that the spatial correlations of background error

can be estimated from the correlations of differences between 48 and 24 hour forecasts verifying at the same time. Runs of the GDAS at T62 resolution for January and February 2004 were performed, using the operational background error covariance, with and without satellite radiances (denoted 'with-sat' and 'no-sat'). Figure 11 shows the time averaged correlation of the difference between 48 and 24 hour forecasts verifying at the same time for the both of these experiments. The correlations are computed in the zonal direction at 45° south latitude (where the satellite radiances are expected to have a large impact), and are averaged over all base points along that latitude circle. Since the correlations for forecasts initialized from the 'with-sat' and 'no-sat' analyses are very similar, we argue that re-tuning the background error covariance with the 'NMC-method' would not change the spatial structure of the covariances. However, it is likely that the background error variances would change, since the 'no-sat' forecasts are significantly less skillful in the Southern Hemisphere (Fig. 12).

In the NCEP SSI system, the structure of the background error covariances are isotropic and homogeneous, and the background error variances are a function of latitude only. Given that the structure of the background error covariances obtained by the NMC method are not likely to be affected by the removal of the satellite radiances, the only remaining tunable parameters are the latitudinally-varying background error variances. Since satellite radiances have the largest impact in the Southern Hemisphere, we multiply the operational background error variances by the function

$$a + b \sin^2 \phi, \quad (9)$$

where ϕ is latitude and a, b are arbitrary constant factors. The constant a controls the amplitude in

the Northern Hemisphere, while b controls the amplitude in the Southern Hemisphere extra-tropics. By numerical experimentation (running the assimilation for one month, and examining the skill of 48-hour forecasts relative to the operational analysis) we have found that $a = 1$ and $b = -0.75$ produces the best results. Figure 12 shows the skill of 48-hour geopotential height forecasts for the 'no-sat' and 'with-sat' experiments, using the operational background error covariances, and the 'no-sat' experiment with the modified background error variances. A negative value of the b parameter implies that the background error variance is reduced in the Southern Hemisphere relative to the operational value. This is a somewhat surprising result, since we expected the background error variance would need to be increased for the 'no-sat' observation network. Independent calculations performed at NCEP by one of the coauthors (Y. Song) have confirmed that that analyses excluding satellite radiances are degraded when $b > 0$.

References

- Anderson, J. L., 2001: An ensemble adjustment Kalman filter for data assimilation. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 2884–2903.
- Anderson, J. L. and S. L. Anderson, 1999: A Monte Carlo implementation of the nonlinear filtering problem to produce ensemble assimilations and forecasts. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **127**, 2741–2758.
- Baek, S.-J., B. R. Hunt, E. Kalnay, E. Ott, and I. Szunyogh, 2006: Local ensemble Kalman filtering in the presence of model bias. *Tellus A*, **58**, 293–306.

- Bishop, C. H., B. Etherton, and S. J. Majumdar, 2001: Adaptive sampling with the ensemble transform Kalman filter. Part I: Theoretical Aspects. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 420–436.
- Bouttier, F., 1994: A dynamical estimation of forecast error covariances in an assimilation system. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **122**, 2376–2390.
- Burgers, G., P. J. van Leeuwen, and G. Evensen, 1998: Analysis scheme in the ensemble Kalman filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **126**, 1719–1724.
- Compo, G. P., J. S. Whitaker, and P. D. Sardeshmukh, 2006: Feasibility of a 100 year reanalysis using only surface pressure data. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **87**, 175–190.
- Courtier, P., J.-N. Thépaut, and A. Hollingsworth, 1994: A strategy for operational implementation of 4D-Var, using an incremental approach. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **120**, 1367–1387.
- Daley, R., 1991: *Atmospheric Data Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 457 pp.
- Derber, J. and W.-S. Wu, 1998: The use of TOVS cloud-cleared radiances in the NCEP SSI analysis system. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 2287–2299.
- Evensen, G., 2003: The Ensemble Kalman Filter: Theoretical formulation and practical implementation. *Ocean Dynamics*, **53**, 343–367.
- Gaspari, G. and S. E. Cohn, 1999: Construction of correlation functions in two and three dimensions. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **125**, 723–757.
- Gelb, A., J. F. Kasper, R. A. Nash, C. F. Price, and A. A. Sutherland, 1974: *Applied Optimal Estimation*. M. I. T. Press, 374 pp.

Global Climate and Weather Modelling Branch, Environmental Modelling Center, 2003: The GFS Atmospheric Model. Office Note 442, NCEP, NOAA/National Weather Service National Centers for Environmental Prediction, Environmental Modelling Center, 5200 Auth Road, Camp Springs, MD 20746.

URL <http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/officenotes/FullTOC.html>

Hamill, T. M., 2006: Ensemble-based data assimilation. *Predictability of Weather and Climate*, Cambridge Press, chapter 6, 124–156.

Hamill, T. M. and C. Snyder, 2000: A hybrid ensemble Kalman filter-3d variational analysis scheme. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **128**, 2905–2919.

Hamill, T. M. and J. S. Whitaker, 2005: Accounting for the error due to unresolved scales in ensemble data assimilation: A comparison of different approaches. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **133**, 3132–3147.

Hamill, T. M., J. S. Whitaker, and C. Snyder, 2001: Distance-dependent filtering of background error covariance estimates in an ensemble Kalman filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 2776–2790.

Houtekamer, P., L. Lefaivre, J. Derome, H. Ritchie, and H. L. Mitchell, 1996: A system simulation approach to ensemble prediction. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **124**, 1225–1242.

Houtekamer, P. L. and H. L. Mitchell, 1998: Data assimilation using an ensemble Kalman filter technique. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **126**, 796–811.

— 2001: A sequential ensemble Kalman filter for atmospheric data assimilation. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **129**, 123–137.

— 2005: Ensemble Kalman Filtering. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **131**, 3269–3289.

Houtekamer, P. L., H. L. Mitchell, G. Pellerin, M. Buehner, M. Charron, L. Spacek, and B. Hansen, 2005: Atmospheric data assimilation with an Ensemble Kalman Filter: Results with real observations. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **133**, 604–620.

Hunt, B., E. Kostelich, and I. Syzunogh, 2006: Efficient data assimilation for spatio-temporal chaos: A local ensemble transform Kalman filter. *Physica D*, submitted.

URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0511236>

Ide, K., P. Courtier, M. Ghil, and A. C. Lorenc, 1997: Unified notation for data assimilation: operational, sequential, and variational. *J. Met. Soc. Japan*, **75 (1B)**, 181–189.

Kalnay, E., L. Hong, T. Miyoshi, S.-C. Yang, and J. Ballabrera, 2006: 4d-Var or Ensemble Kalman Filter? *Tellus*, submitted.

Kaminski, P. G., J. A. E. Bryson, and S. F. Schmidt, 1971: Discrete square-root filtering: a survey of current techniques. *IEEE T. Automat. Control*, **AC-16**, 727–736.

Keppenne, C. L., M. M. Rienecker, N. P. Kurkowski, and D. A. Adamec, 2005: Ensemble Kalman filter assimilation of temperature and altimeter data with bias correction and application to seasonal prediction. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, **12**, 491–503.

Kistler, R., E. Kalnay, W. Collins, S. Saha, G. White, J. Woollen, M. Chelliah, W. Ebisuzaki, M. Kanamitsu, V. Kousky, H. van den Dool, R. Jenne, and M. Fiorino, 2001: The NCEP-NCAR 50-Year Reanalysis: Monthly Means CD-ROM and Documentation. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **82**, 247–268.

- Liu, Z.-Q. and F. Rabier, 2002: The interaction between model resolution, observation resolution and observation density in data assimilation: A one-dimensional study. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **128**, 1367–1386.
- Lorenc, A. C., 1986: Analysis methods for numerical weather prediction. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **112**, 1177–1194.
- Lynch, P. and X.-Y. Huang, 1992: Initialization of the HIRLAM model using a digital filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **120**, 1019–1034.
- Meng, Z. and F. Zhang, 2006: Test of an ensemble Kalman filter for mesoscale and regional-scale data assimilation. Part II: Imperfect model experiments. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, in press.
- Miyoshi, T. and S. Yamane, 2006: Local ensemble transform Kalman filtering with an AGCM at T159/L60 resolution. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, submitted.
- NCEP Environmental Modelling Center, 2004: SSI Analysis System 2004. Office Note 443, NCEP, NOAA/National Weather Service National Centers for Environmental Prediction, Environmental Modelling Center, 5200 Auth Road, Camp Springs, MD 20746.
URL <http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/officenotes/FullTOC.html>
- Ochotta, T., C. Gebhardt, D. Saupe, and W. Wergen, 2005: Adaptive thinning of atmospheric observations in data assimilation with vector quantization and filtering methods. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **131**, 3427–3427.
- Oppenheim, A. and R. W. Schaffer, 1989: *Discrete-Time Signal Processing*. Prentice-Hall, 879 pp.

- Ott, E., B. R. Hunt, I. Szunyogh, A. Zimin, E. Kostelich, M. Corazza, E. Kalnay, D. Patil, and J. A. Yorke, 2004: A local Ensemble Kalman Filter for atmospheric data assimilation. *Tellus*, **56A**, 415–428.
- Parrish, D. and J. Derber, 1992: The National Meteorological Center’s spectral statistical interpolation analysis system. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **120**, 1747–1763.
- Pires, C., R. Vautard, and O. Talagrand, 1996: On extending the limits of variational assimilation in chaotic systems. *Tellus*, **48A**, 96–121.
- Rabier, F., H. Järvinen, E. Klinker, J.-F. Mafouf, and A. Simmons, 2000: The ecmwf operational implementation of four-dimensional variational assimilation. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **126**, 1143–1170.
- Simmons, A. J. and A. Hollingsworth, 2002: Some aspects of the improvement in skill of numerical weather prediction. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **128**, 647–677.
- Snyder, C. and F. Zhang, 2003: Assimilation of simulated doppler radar observations with an ensemble Kalman filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **131**, 1663–1677.
- Thépaut, J.-N. and P. Courtier, 1991: Four-dimensional data assimilation using the adjoint of a multilevel primitive equation model. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **117**, 1225–1254.
- Tippett, M. K., J. L. Anderson, C. H. Bishop, T. M. Hamill, and J. S. Whitaker, 2003: Ensemble Square Root Filters. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **131**, 1485–1490.

- Whitaker, J. S., G. P. Compo, and T. M. Hamill, 2004: Reanalysis without radiosondes using ensemble data assimilation. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **132**, 1190–1200.
- Whitaker, J. S. and T. M. Hamill, 2002: Ensemble data assimilation without perturbed observations. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **130**, 1913–1924.
- Wilks, D. S., 2006: *Statistical Methods in the Atmospheric Sciences*. Academic Press, 467 pp., second edition.
- Zhang, F., C. Snyder, and J. Sun, 2004: Impacts of initial estimate and observation availability on convective-scale data assimilation with an Ensemble Kalman Filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **132**, 1238–1253.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Locations of (A) radiosonde observations, (B) aircraft observations (AIREP and PIREP observations between 300 and 150 hPa), and (C) surface marine (ship and buoy) pressure observations for 00 UTC and 12 UTC January 10, 2004.

Figure 2: Root-mean-square fits of 6 and 48-h forecasts initialized from 00, 06, 12 and 18 UTC EDA ensemble mean and NCEP-Benchmark analyses to radiosonde observations for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA analyses are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details). Note that the ordinate is sigma layer, not pressure level, since the calculations were done in sigma coordinates. There is one data point for each interval of width $\Delta\sigma = 0.1$, beginning at $\sigma = 0.9$, representing all of the observations in each layer.

Figure 3: Vertical profiles of 48-hour forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis). Values for the Northern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^\circ N$) and the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^\circ S$) are shown for geopotential height and meridional wind, for each of the EDA experiments and the NCEP-Benchmark experiment.

Figure 4: 500 hPa geopotential height forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis) as a function of forecast lead time, for the Northern and Southern Hemisphere extra-tropics (the region poleward of $20^{\circ}N$). The thinner curve is for forecast initialized from the ensemble mean EDA-addinf analysis, and the thicker curve is for forecasts initialized from the NCEP-Benchmark analysis.

Figure 5: February 3, 2004 00 UTC Southern Hemisphere 500 hPa geopotential height analyses for the EDA-addinf (A), the NCEP-Benchmark (B), and the NCEP-Operational (C) analysis systems. The difference between the EDA-addinf and NCEP-Benchmark analyses is shown in (D). The contour interval is 75 m in (A)-(C) and 40 m in (D). The 5125 and 5425 meter contours are emphasized in (A)-(C). All contours in (D) are negative.

Figure 6: As in Figure 4, but for total precipitable water (in mm).

Figure 7: Precipitable water analysis increment (thick black contour lines, contour interval 0.5 mm, dashed lines negative, zero contour suppressed) from the EDA-addinf system at 00 UTC January 30, 2004 associated with a surface pressure observation located at the black dot at the center of the map. The surface pressure observation is 1 hPa lower than the ensemble mean first-guess forecast (thin black contours, interval 5 hPa). The gray-shaded field is the ensemble mean first-guess precipitable water (scale on right denotes contour levels).

Figure 8: Square-root of ensemble spread plus observation error variance at radiosonde locations for 6-h forecasts initialized from 06 UTC and 18 UTC EDA for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA ensembles are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details). The root-mean-square fit of the 6-h EDA-addinf ensemble mean forecast to the radiosonde observations is also shown (heavy solid curve).

Figure 9: Mean difference between 6-forecast and radiosonde observations (bias) for forecasts initialized from 06 UTC and 18 UTC EDA for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA ensembles are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details).

Figure 10: Vertical profiles of 48-hour geopotential height and meridional wind forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis). Values for the Northern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}N$) and the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}S$) are shown for the EDA-addinf, LETKF-addinf and the NCEP-Benchmark experiments.

Figure 11: The correlation of 48 minus 24-hour forecasts verifying at the same time at 45° south latitude, averaged over all longitudes and over all forecasts initialized between January 8 and February 8, 2004. The dashed (solid) line is for forecasts from the NCEP GDAS 'no-sat' ('with-sat') analyses. Both analyses use the operational background error covariances. See the Appendix for details.

Figure 12: Vertical profiles of 48-hour forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis) in the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}S$), for the NCEP GDAS 'with-sat', 'no-sat' and 'retuned no-sat' experiments (see Appendix for details).

	EDA-addinf	EDA-multinf	EDA-relaxprior	NCEP-Benchmark
aircraft meridional wind (m/s)	7.57 (99%)	7.54 (>99%)	7.68 (91%)	7.78
surface marine pressure (hPa)	3.13 (>99%)	3.24 (>99%)	3.21 (>99%)	3.40

Table 1: Fits of 48-h forecasts initialized from 00, 06, 12 and 18 UTC EDA ensemble mean and NCEP-Benchmark analyses to aircraft (AIREP and PIREP) observations between 300 and 150 hPa and surface marine (ship and buoy) pressure observations for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA analyses are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details). The confidence level (in percent) for the difference between each of the EDA results and the NCEP-Benchmark result is also given. This confidence level is computed using a two-tailed t-test for the difference between means of paired samples, taking into account serial correlations in the data.

	EDA-addinf	EDA-multinf	EDA-relaxprior	NCEP-Benchmark
NH extratropics (hPa)	3.29 (>99%)	3.43 (75%)	3.39 (85%)	3.48
SH extratropics (hPa)	3.21 (>99%)	3.24 (>99%)	3.23 (>99%)	3.75

Table 2: As in 1, but for surface marine pressure observations in the Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere extratropics (poleward of $20^{\circ}N$ and $20^{\circ}S$).




Figure 1: Locations of (A) radiosonde observations, (B) aircraft observations (AIREP and PIREP observations between 300 and 150 hPa), and (C) surface marine (ship and buoy) pressure observations for 00 UTC and 12 UTC January 10, 2004.




Figure 2: Root-mean-square fits of 6 and 48-h forecasts initialized from 00, 06, 12 and 18 UTC EDA ensemble mean and NCEP-Benchmark analyses to radiosonde observations for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA analyses are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details). Note that the ordinate is sigma layer, not pressure level, since the calculations were done in sigma coordinates. There is one data point for each interval of width $\Delta\sigma = 0.1$, beginning at $\sigma = 0.9$, representing all of the observations in each layer.




Figure 3: Vertical profiles of 48-hour forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis). Values for the Northern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}N$) and the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}S$) are shown for geopotential height and meridional wind, for each of the EDA experiments and the NCEP-Benchmark experiment.




Figure 4: 500 hPa geopotential height forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis) as a function of forecast lead time, for the Northern and Southern Hemisphere extra-tropics (the region poleward of $20^{\circ}N$). The thinner curve is for forecast initialized from the ensemble mean EDA-addinf analysis, and the thicker curve is for forecasts initialized from the NCEP-Benchmark analysis.

2004020300




Figure 5: February 3, 2004 00 UTC Southern Hemisphere 500 hPa geopotential height analyses for the EDA-addinf (A), the NCEP-Benchmark (B), and the NCEP-Operational (C) analysis systems. The difference between the EDA-addinf and NCEP-Benchmark analyses is shown in (D). The contour interval is 75 m in (A)-(C) and 40 m in (D). The 5125 and 5425 meter contours are emphasized in (A)-(C). All contours in (D) are negative.




Figure 6: As in Figure 4, but for total precipitable water (in mm).




Figure 7: Precipitable water analysis increment (thick black contour lines, contour interval 0.5 mm, dashed lines negative, zero contour suppressed) from the EDA-addinf system at 00 UTC January 30, 2004 associated with a surface pressure observation located at the black dot at the center of the map. The surface pressure observation is 1 hPa lower than the ensemble mean first-guess forecast (thin black contours, interval 5 hPa). The gray-shaded field is the ensemble mean first-guess precipitable water (scale on right denotes contour levels).




Figure 8: Square-root of ensemble spread plus observation error variance at radiosonde locations for 6-h forecasts initialized from 06 UTC and 18 UTC EDA for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA ensembles are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details). The root-mean-square fit of the 6-h EDA-addinf ensemble mean forecast to the radiosonde observations is also shown (heavy solid curve).





Figure 9: Mean difference between 6-forecast and radiosonde observations (bias) for forecasts initialized from 06 UTC and 18 UTC EDA for 20040108 to 20040208. Three different EDA ensembles are shown, each employing a different method for parameterizing system error (see text for details).




Figure 10: Vertical profiles of 48-hour geopotential height and meridional wind forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis). Values for the Northern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}N$) and the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of $20^{\circ}S$) are shown for the EDA-addinf, LETKF-addinf and the NCEP-Benchmark experiments.




Figure 11: The correlation of 48 minus 24-hour forecasts verifying at the same time at 45° south latitude, averaged over all longitudes and over all forecasts initialized between January 8 and February 8, 2004. The dashed (solid) line is for forecasts from the NCEP GDAS 'no-sat' ('with-sat') analyses. Both analyses use the operational background error covariances. See the Appendix for details.




Figure 12: Vertical profiles of 48-hour forecast error (measured relative to the NCEP-Operational analysis) in the Southern Hemisphere (poleward of 20°S), for the NCEP GDAS 'with-sat', 'no-sat' and 'retuned no-sat' experiments (see Appendix for details).